

REMARKS

E.D. 6/14/05  
Interview Record  
OK

At the outset, the courtesies extended by the Examiner in granting the 12 April 2005 interview, and the professionalism he demonstrated during the interview, are appreciatively noted. At the interview, the references cited by the Examiner in the 14 January 2005 Office Action were discussed in light of the clarifying amendments proposed to the claims by the undersigned attorney, as set forth herein.

Responsive to the 14 January 2005 Office Action and the discussions had at the interview, Claims 4 and 10 are now amended for further prosecution with the other pending claims. It is believed that with such amendment of claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. More specifically, the Examiner stated that the "package" recited in Claim 10 must be shown, else cancelled from the claim. It is believed that the amendments hereby incorporated into Claim 10 now obviate the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

The Examiner objected to the Specification for containing improper phraseology in the Abstract. The Examiner also noted the confusing use of reference character 25 to identify different features in the disclosure. Appropriate